

Without the folding room, the House is a more confused and inefficient operation. Is this what the American people voted for in the last election?

And, there is a very important moral issue at play. Over 100 people lost their jobs when the folding room was abruptly shut down. Many of these people were loyal employees of the House with over 20 years of faithful service. I believe that the treatment of the folding room staff was wrong. I am very distrustful that many are starting to believe that the House is the last plantation. If the labor laws of America are to be applied to Congress, then the employees of the House should be treated with at least minimum levels of respect and decency.

I want Congress to be efficient and mindful of the taxpayers' money. However, by closing the folding room, the total money spent by the House will most likely increase, constituent service will be slowed, and the House will appear to be even more out of touch. The Oversight Committee's action are well intentioned, but poorly implemented. The House may find that it needs to look at this issue again.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RYAN WHITE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is fast approaching the time in this country when we will reauthorize a very important health care act known as the Ryan White Care Act. This act does tremendous amounts of good in terms of offering health care for those afflicted with this dreadful disease.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] for his efforts to raise the awareness of this body, as well as this country, as to the former testing practices of the CDC, and we also owe a debt of gratitude to him for making us aware of the failed policies of the ethicists that have advised the CDC, for over this past year we have been blindly testing mothers and children for this disease, without their knowledge, and when finding positive cases we have refused to identify those positive cases and offer treatment for both newborn children and their mothers, this all at the advice of a group of ethicists that told our CDC that this was an appropriate practice.

The other disturbing thing about that is that the CDC thought it was an appropriate practice, that newborn children infected with a deadly virus and knowledge of that by our own Centers for Disease Control should not have the opportunity for the best treatment that we have available, and also their mothers should not have the knowledge or opportunity that they in fact could be treated, their quality of life could be prolonged, and complications arising from this disease could be prevented.

That, however, has not been the full story of what has happened. Because of

the awareness that has come to light through the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], we will be proposing, with the new Ryan White authorization, an opportunity for children to have a future.

□ 1245

There is no place today where we have and can make an impact on the HIV epidemic in this country like that associated with women of reproductive age. Today the fastest growing segment in this epidemic is women in the reproductive age category. It is growing 8 times faster in this group than in any other group in our country.

We also have the opportunity to truly impact newborn babies, because now we have a treatment that prevents, two-thirds of the time, infection in the baby from a woman who might be carrying the HIV virus.

The opportunity that will be coming before us will be shadowed in many debates, a debate on confidentiality, a debate on the rights of women not to be tested, but the ultimate debate that will come about as we reauthorize Ryan White will be the debate of how we have handled this epidemic in our country. In 1981, the first case was diagnosed, and today we have 2.5 million people in our country with this virus. We should ask if we are proud of the job that this country has done in facing this disease, in the way that our Government agencies have handled the epidemic and their approach to it.

But, most importantly, where we have an opportunity to make a difference, to prevent infection in newborn children, we should not shrink back from that. We should stand up and make the difference, the difference that not only will save several thousand babies' lives each year but also, in this time of scarce resources, will add a quarter of a billion dollars in saved health care costs just from testing mothers during their first trimester of pregnancy.

It is my hope and my wish that we will step aside from the politically correct positions of our country and look at the real harm that this infection has caused, not to make callous judgments on those who have unfortunately acquired this disease but all work together to make a new and improved effort at making a difference, saving lives and controlling this epidemic.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2265, MOTOR SPORTS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced H.R. 2265, the Motor Sports Protection Act to meet the threat to professional auto racing posed by Bill Clinton's assault on tobacco.

If tobacco companies are forced to remove their sponsorship of racing the very existence of NASCAR, NHRA, and formula one is in doubt. NASCAR alone is a \$2-billion industry. An advertising ban will put thousands of Americans out of work.

Richard Petty the king of racing noted: "That all race fans can rally around this bill and I want to help stop Big Brother from attacking law abiding, family oriented, hard working citizens who enjoy racing." Mr. Speaker, this is not about tobacco alone. It is about whether we will stand up and fight another blatant power grab by the Federal Government. We must draw the line against bureaucratic meddling with this wholesome, all-American sport. H.R. 2265, is the first step in our fight to win back Government for our people. Please join the effort and help save racing.

THE BALANCED-BUDGET MYTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to preliminarily begin with some general remarks and then as I go into my allotted time, I will be more specific in the issue that I feel is in urgent need to be discussed.

The reason I wanted to have some preliminary remarks by way of explanation is that this period set aside that we designate as special orders is a very interesting one with a very interesting history in which I am very proud of the role I played in developing it into an accepted and formal part of the procedures.

In the beginning of my career here in the House, which of course spans quite a number of years going back to 1961, it was not the custom to practice what we call today special orders. It was looked upon as a quite radical if not an unaccustomed practice, and the procedure was very, very formal, very standardized, and allowed for no real participation even during the general consideration of the full House for any but the very few selected leaders who exercised total power at that time.

Well, of course, that is a long time ago. Those of us who have managed to span these years have noticed, with some gratification, the changes since that rather straitjacketed and quite sterile period of time. Of course in the interim the country has literally been shaken to root and marrow with some very, very substantial issues and developments that have engulfed it, not because there were issues born spontaneously from within our country, but as the work shrunk and the United States after the war became an inescapable even though quite reluctant leader of